

MINUTES
YORK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
York Hall
November 8, 2000
7:00 PM

MEMBERS

Spencer W. Semmes, Chair
Andrew A. Simasek, Vice Chair
Robert E. Beil, Jr.
Robert D. Heavner
Michael H. Hendricks
Thomas G. Shepperd
Ann F. White

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Spencer Semmes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All of the members were present. Staff members present were Timothy C. Cross, Carla Blake Hook, and Olivia D. Wilkinson.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. White moved the approval of minutes of the October 11, 2000 regular meeting and they were approved unanimously.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR

The Chair welcomed visitors and explained the legal mandate of the Planning Commission, its composition of citizen volunteers, and its mission as an advisory body to the Board of Supervisors for all land use issues.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mr. Ray Lawson, 104 Yorkville Road, spoke of the Secondary Roads Plan. Mr. Lawson expressed concern about a possible traffic increase if turn lanes are added to intersections along Lakeside Drive, particularly at Yorkville Road. He further requested that the Commission be cautious about allowing trees to be cut down because green spaces add to the beauty of the County, and to provide for the replacement of any trees that must be removed.

Mr. R. H. Martin, 64 East Avenue, Hampton, Virginia, introduced himself as a partner of John G. Martin Company which owns a parcel of land at 5625 George Washington Memorial Highway. He inquired if the drawing representing Projects 7 and 8 of the Secondary Roads Plan is an accurate drawing of Burts Road. Mr. Cross answered that it is a conceptual drawing not to scale or accurately drawn.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application No. UP-563-00, Seaford Yacht Club: Request for an amendment to a conforming special use pursuant to Section 24.1-115(c)(4) and Section 24.1-115(d)(3) of the York County Zoning Ordinance to authorize an expansion of the Seaford Yacht Club located at 3108-A Goodwin Neck Road (Route 173), and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 25-(32)-B. The yacht club proposes to expand its existing meeting room, including handicapped access and expanded parking. The Comprehensive Plan designates this area for Low Density Residential Development.

Ms. Olivia Wilkinson, following a brief video, presented a summary of the staff memorandum to the Commission dated October 25, 2000, in which the staff recommended approval subject to conditions contained in Resolution PC00-29.

Mr. Shepperd asked about the "administrative" issue mentioned in the memorandum, and Ms. Wilkinson explained that the applicant has requested a deviation from the Zoning Ordinance requirement that parking lots be paved with asphalt, to permit the applicant to use a gravel parking lot, and added that the Zoning Administrator will decide during the site plan review process if that will be granted. Ms. Wilkinson further explained that the applicant has designed the proposed expansion to mitigate any impact on drainage by constructing the proposed addition on an existing concrete slab and constructing a deck of wood through which rainwater will flow. Stormwater management calculations will be submitted with the site plan, she said, and drainage impacts will be addressed at that time.

Mr. Randall Strickland, 3108 Goodwin Neck Road, represented the applicant. Mr. Strickland gave a brief overview of the history of Seaford Yacht Club since the land was acquired in 1983. He said the membership had fluctuated between 95 and 110 members until five years ago, when dock facilities were expanded to 70 slips, but has since grown to its present 120 members and the club does not have room for nor expect any more growth of total membership. Mr. Strickland said members have become very active in club activities and attendance has increased to 150 persons. The application is to add space to accommodate this increased number of active members.

Mr. Strickland said the Seaford Yacht Club is adjacent to Back Creek Park, which provides the same amenities to the public as the club provides for its members. He said the Club hosts two activities per week. Automobile traffic to the Club should not generate traffic through any neighborhoods, he added. Mr. Strickland said the buildings and grounds of the Yacht Club are complementary to its surroundings and are an asset to the Back Creek area of Seaford.

No one else came forward to speak, and the Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hendricks noted a recent letter to the Daily Press expressing concern about increased traffic on Goodwin Neck Road if the application is granted. Mr. Shepperd felt that any additional development, whether business or residential, would add some traffic but was satisfied with the staff research on traffic issues. Mr. Heavner did not believe that ten additional members over a ten-year period should have any noticeable impact Goodwin Neck Road traffic and he supported approval of the expansion. Mr. Simasek supported the application and the applicant's offer to

add curbing and increase green space and other amenities, but he hoped the County would permit the gravel parking surface requested by the applicant.

Mr. Shepperd moved the adoption of Resolution PC00-29 to recommend approval. It was adopted 7:0.

PC00-29

On motion of Mr. Shepperd, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

**A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO A
CONFORMING SPECIAL USE TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPANSION OF THE
SEAFORD YACHT CLUB**

WHEREAS, Seaford Yacht Club has submitted Application No. UP 563-00, which requests an amendment to a conforming special use pursuant to Section 24.1-115(d) of the York County Zoning Ordinance to authorize the expansion of Seaford Yacht Club located at 3108-A Goodwin Neck Road (Route 173) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 25-(32)-B; and

WHEREAS, said application has been referred to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments and staff recommendation with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 8th day of November, 2000, that Application No. UP-563-00 be, and it is hereby, transmitted to the York County Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval to authorize the expansion of Seaford Yacht Club located at 3108-A Goodwin Neck Road (Route 173) subject to the following conditions:

1. This use permit shall authorize the expansion of the Seaford Yacht Club located at 3108-A Goodwin Neck Road (Route 173) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 25-(32)-B.
2. A site plan shall be prepared in accordance with Article V of the York County Zoning Ordinance. Said site plan shall be in substantial conformance with the conceptual plan received by the Planning Division entitled "Seaford Yacht Club Expansion" and dated September 8, 2000 and included in the file as part of this application.
3. The expansion of the parking lot shall be consistent with the requirements set forth in Section 24.1-609(b)(1) of the York County Zoning Ordinance.
4. The applicant shall be responsible for compliance with the regulations in Section 24.1-115(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance that pertain to the recordation of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court

Application No. UP-564-00, Kenneth Dale Moore: Request for a special use permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-306 of the York County Zoning Ordinance (category 14, number 6), to authorize the establishment of a mini-storage warehouse facility on a 1.74-acre parcel located at 5922 George Washington Memorial Highway approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of George Washington Memorial Highway (Route 17) and Wolftrap Road (Route 630) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 29-(4)-4B. The proposed development is an expansion of the existing Stor Moore mini-storage warehouse facility located at 6000 George Washington Memorial Highway. The property is zoned GB (General Business) and the Comprehensive Plan designates this area for General Business development.

A brief video was shown prior to Mr. Tim Cross's summation of his memorandum to the Commission dated October 30, 2000, in which the staff recommended denial by the adoption of proposed Resolution PC00-30. If, however, the Commission recommends approval, Mr. Cross recommended that approval be subject to the conditions of Resolution PC00-31.

Mr. Heavner wanted to know the required building setback; Mr. Cross said it is 45 feet from the future right-of-way line.

Mr. Semmes opened the public hearing.

Mr. Kenneth Dale Moore, 229 Redoubt Road, spoke in support of his application. Mr. Moore noted that the project was originally designed to include another use at the front of the parcel, but after more than four years of having the property on the market he has received no offers to purchase that section. He said it is a continuing financial burden to him.

Mr. Moore said the design of the landscape berm took into consideration a future Route 17 widening. He envisions first-class landscaping similar to the Canon Virginia landscaping that is visible along Canon Boulevard and offered to work with the County to provide whatever landscaping was required. Mr. Moore said the 45-foot setback requirement doesn't allow for anything else on the property. He has endeavored to keep the project and grounds in excellent condition and attractive and will continue to do so, he said.

Mr. Moore said the existing storage units are now fully leased after three years of operation and believed that recent and future apartments and condominiums should create increased demand for storage units. He employs over 100 people in five businesses in York County and would like to keep all of his businesses anchored in the County. He offered to do any reasonable thing to make the project acceptable for approval.

Mr. Semmes inquired of any plans to move or eliminate the existing bay doors that face Route 17. Mr. Moore said he has no plans to eliminate or reposition the bay doors but would consider adding visual barriers from Route 17, such as raising the berm. Discussion followed related to the elevation and slope of the proposed berm and approval from VDOT. Mr. Moore said the current setback includes the reserve requested by VDOT for the future widening of Route 17.

Mr. Simasek noted that, while he understands Mr. Moore's economic burden, the design for the proposed expansion goes all the way to the 45-foot setback line which could raise issues of

aesthetics, particularly since any future owner may not have the same commitment to aesthetics as Mr. Moore. He asked if it would be feasible to reduce the project by 25 units. Mr. Moore said he could not do that and make a profit. He said he would be willing to create a berm to a height that would obscure the bay doors from Route 17.

Mr. Simasek asked if the proposed landscaping meets standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and Mr. Cross indicated that it would with the addition of a few trees.

Responding to Mr. Shepperd, Mr. Moore estimated the current real estate tax on the undeveloped portion of the property to be \$5,000 per year. The staff had no estimate of the potential loss of revenue if not approved.

Mrs. White inquired about the building façade, and Mr. Moore offered to use brick on the Route 17 side if required to do so, but it would not show from the road and would increase his costs. He said the façade would complement the existing units, in any case.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Hendricks said when the Commission reviewed the original application for the existing project, the major selling point was that some other type of activity, such as a restaurant would screen the storage facility. He recalled conceptual drawings at that time showing other revenue-generating activities included in the project. He said he had not seen anything sufficient to change his mind and that there should be no rush to approve an inadequate proposal. He was opposed to the expansion.

Mr. Beil was not in favor of approval because the bay doors would still face a main thoroughfare.

Mrs. White wanted to uphold the Comprehensive Plan's vision for Route 17.

Mr. Shepperd said it was probably one of the nicest storage facilities he had seen, but he was not inclined to vote for approval because it would not comply with the clear intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Heavner asked of any zoning classifications allow storage facilities, and Mr. Cross said General Industrial (IG) allows storage facilities by right. Mr. Heavner thought IG was a good classification for this type of business, and acknowledged that Mr. Moore had developed and taken good care of this very attractive business facility.

Mr. Semmes felt Mr. Moore had done an excellent job attempting to mitigate visual- and aesthetic-related concerns of the Commission, but he did not believe a mini-storage warehouse was the best use of the property and would not comply with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hendricks moved to recommend denial by adopting Resolution PC00-30. It carried 7:0, and reads:

On motion of Mr. Hendricks, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING MINI-STORAGE WAREHOUSE FACILITY ONTO AN ADJACENT 1.74-ACRE PARCEL ON ROUTE 17

WHEREAS, Kenneth Dale Moore has submitted Application No. UP 564-00, which requests a special use permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-306 (Category 14, No. 6) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, to authorize the expansion of an existing mini-storage warehouse facility onto an adjacent 1.74-acre parcel located at 5922 George Washington Memorial Highway approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of George Washington Memorial Highway (Route 17) and Wolftrap Road (Route 630) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 29-(4)-4B; and

WHEREAS, said application has been referred to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments and staff recommendation with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 8th day of November, 2000, that Application No. UP-564-00 be, and it is hereby, transmitted to the York County Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of denial.

Application No. ZT-53-00, York County Board of Supervisors: Request to amend the York County Code, Chapter 24.1, Zoning, Section 24.1-306, Table of Land Uses, to prohibit the following uses in the IL (Limited Industrial) zoning district: meeting halls, recreational, social uses, or private clubs operated by social, fraternal, civic, public, or similar organizations (category 4, number 1); pre-school, child care, nursery schools (category 5, number 1); convenience stores (category 10, number 5); camera shops, one-hour photo service (category 10, number 8); florists (category 10, number 9); bike stores, including rental/repair (category 10, number 28); optical goods, health aids or appliances (category 10, number 30); second hand, used merchandise retailers (category 10, number 34); and barber/beauty shops (category 11, number 2).

Mr. Cross presented a summary of the memorandum to the Commission dated October 23, 2000 containing the staff recommendation of approval through the adoption of proposed Resolution PC00-28.

Discussion followed about whether retail dry cleaning establishments and other "apparel services" should be prohibited in the IL district. After some discussion it was decided to postpone any recommendation until the Commission can discuss it during the Zoning Ordinance review. The members also mentioned other uses and ultimately agreed to revisit those items, as well, during the Zoning Ordinance review to consider recommending special use permits for

certain activities in the IL district. Mr. Hendricks recommended that the Commission approve the text amendment sponsored by the Board of Supervisors and at a later time consider the use permit issue.

Mr. Cross, responding to Mr. Shepperd, clarified that the word "bike" refers specifically to bicycles and not to motorcycles.

Chair Semmes opened the public hearing. There being no one to speak, he closed the public hearing.

Ms. White moved the adoption of Resolution PC00-28 and it carried unanimously.

PC00-28

On motion of Ms. White, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE YORK COUNTY CODE, CHAPTER 24.1, ZONING, SECTION 24.1-306, TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN USES IN THE LIMITED INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICT

WHEREAS, at its meeting on September 19, 2000, the York County Board of Supervisors sponsored Application No. ZT-53-00 to amend the York County Zoning Ordinance to prohibit certain uses in the Limited Industrial (IL) zoning district; and

WHEREAS, said application has been referred to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments and staff recommendation with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 8th day of November, 2000, that Application No. ZT-53-00 be transmitted to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval to amend Chapter 24.1, Zoning, of the York County Code, Section 24.1-306 (Category 4-Community Uses, Category 5-Educational Uses, Category 10-Commercial/Retail, Category 11-Business/Professional Service, and Category 15-Limited Industrial Activities) to read and provide as follows:

* * *

York County Planning Commission Minutes

November 8, 2000

Page 8

P=PERMITTED USE S=PERMITTED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 4 - COMMUNITY USES												
1. Meeting Halls, Recreational, Social Uses, or Private Clubs Operated by Social, Fraternal, Civic, Public, or Similar Organizations		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	P	S		P	P
2. Any Recreational or Social Uses Approved as a Part of a Subdivision or Site Plan and Operated Primarily for Use of Residents or Occupants of Such Development	P	P	P	P	P	P				P			

* * *

P=PERMITTED USE S=PERMITTED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 5 - EDUCATIONAL USES												
1. Pre-school, Child Care, Nursery School		S	S	S	S	S	P	P	P	S	P	P	
2. Elementary, Intermediate, High School and/or Vo-Tech and Related Support Facilities a) York County Public Schools b) Other	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	S	S
		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	P	S	S	S	S
3. Technical, Vocational, Business School								S	P		P	P	
4. College/University		S						S	P		P		

* * *

P=PERMITTED USE S=PERMITTED BY SPECIAL USE PERMIT	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 10 - COMMERCIAL / RETAIL												
1. Antiques/Reproductions, Art Gallery							P	P	P	P	P		
2. Wearing Apparel Store							P	P	P		P		
3. Appliance Sales									P		P		
4. Auction House								P	P		P		
5. Convenience Store							S	S	P		P	P	

York County Planning Commission Minutes

November 8, 2000

Page 9

6. Grocery Store							P		P		P		
7. Book, Magazine, Card Shop							P	P	P		P		
8. Camera Shop, One-Hour Photo Service							P	P	P		P	P	P
9. Florist							P	P	P		P	P	P
10. Gifts, Souvenirs Shop								P	P		P		
11. Hardware, Paint Store								P	P		P	P	P
12. Hobby, Craft Shop								P	P		P		
13. Household Furnishings, Furniture									P		P		
14. Jewelry Store								P	P		P		
15. Lumberyard, Building Materials									S		P	P	P
16. Music, Records, Video Tapes								P	P		P		
17. Drug Store							S	S	P		P		
18. Radio and TV Sales								S	P		P		
19. Sporting Goods Store								P	P		P		
20. Firearms Sales and Service								S	S		S		
21. Tobacco Store								P	P		P		
22. Toy Store								S	P		P		
23. Gourmet Items/Health Foods/Candy/ Specialty Foods/Bakery Shops							P	P	P		P		
24. ABC Store								P	P		P		
25. Bait, Tackle/Marine Supplies Including Incidental Grocery Sales									P	P	P	S	S
26. Office Equipment & Supplies								P	P		P	P	P
27. Pet Store							S	P	P		P		
28. Bike Store, Including Rental/Repair							P	P	P		P	P	P
29. Piece Goods, Sewing Supplies							P	P	P		P		
30. Optical Goods, Health Aids or Appliances								P	P		P	P	P
31. Fish, Seafood Store									P	P	P		
32. Department, Variety, Discount Store									P		P		
33. Auto Parts, Accessories (new parts)								P	P		P		
34. Second Hand, Used Merchandise Retailers (household items, etc.)								P	P			P	
a) without outside display/storage								S	S			S	
b) with outside display/storage													
35. Storage shed and utility building sales/display									S			P	P

* * *

York County Planning Commission Minutes

November 8, 2000

Page 10

USES	RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS						
	RC	RR	R20	R13	R7	RMF	NB	LB	GB	WCI	EO	IL	IG
	CATEGORY 11 - BUSINESS / PROFESSIONAL SERVICE												
1. Broadcasting Studio								P	P		P	P	P
2. Barber/Beauty Shop							P	P	P		P	P	P
3. Apparel Services (Dry Cleaning/Laundry retail) Laundromat, Tailor, Shoe Repair, Etc.)							P	P	P		P	P	P
4. Funeral Home								S	P		P		
5. a) Photographic Studio							S	P	P		P	P	P
b) Film Processing Lab								S	P		P	P	P
6. Household Items Repair									P		P	P	P
7. Personal Services (Fortune Teller, Tattoo, Pawn Shop, Etc.)									S				
8. a) Banks, Financial Institutions							P	P	P		P		
b) Freestanding Automatic Teller Machines							P	P	P	S	P		
9. Offices						S	P	P	P		P	P	P
10. Hotel & Motel								S	P	S	P		
11. Timeshare Resort						S			S	S	S		
12. Restaurant/Sit Down								P	P		P		
13. Restaurant/Brew-Pub									P		P		
14. Restaurant/Fast Food								S	P		P		
15. Restaurant/Drive In								S	P		P		
16. Restaurant - Carry-out/Delivery only							S	P	P				
17. Small-Engine Repair (lawn and garden equipment, outboard motors, etc.)									P	P	P	P	P
18. Tool, Household Equipment, Lawn & Garden Equipment, Rental Establishment									P		P	P	P
19. Establishments Providing Printing, Photocopying, Blueprinting, Mailing, Facsimile Reception & Transmission or similar business services to the general public, and business and professional users								P	P		P	P	P
20. Professional Pharmacy							P	P	P		P		

* * *

The Chair called a brief recess at 8:34 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 8:39.

NEW BUSINESS

Transportation Issues: Recommend a project priority listing for secondary road construction for the six-year period 2001-2002 through 2006-2007. Roadways proposed for inclusion in the six-year plan include but are not limited to Lakeside Drive, Dare Road, Big Bethel Road, Fort Eustis Boulevard extension, Penniman Road, Carys Chapel Road, Burts Road, Yorkville Road, Yorktown Road, Seaford Road, Allens Mill Road, and Newman Road. Also included are pedestrian/bicycle improvements, including Cook Road and the Waller Mill Rail-Trail.

Mr. Cross briefed the members on the staff report dated October 26, 2000 and the staff recommendation of approval. He elaborated on the various methods the Commission has used in the past to receive public comment on the Secondary Roads priority listing and noted that the Board, but not the Planning Commission, is required to conduct a public hearing.

Mr. Shepperd asked if Lakeside Drive was on the list last year and Mr. Cross said that it was at the top of last year's priority listing. Mr. Shepperd said no progress appears to have been made on that project or on the third-ranked project from last year, Big Bethel Road. He commented on citizens' frustration because of the appearance that "nothing happens" on secondary road construction. Mr. Cross responded that the County only sets the priorities and tries to keep the projects moving forward each year, but money has always been a big issue. He explained that VDOT allocates approximately \$2 million per year to the County for secondary roads and works with the County to allocate portions of that total amount to the projects listed as priorities. The Board and VDOT conduct a joint public hearing before the County submits its priority listing to VDOT each year, he added.

Mr. Beil added that the allocation comes from VDOT and the County is not in control of the amount but recommends to VDOT how it should be spent.

Ms. White pointed out that "road" widening and "shoulder" widening appear to have been used in the staff memorandum and the proposed resolution to describe the same work on Seaford Road. Mr. Cross confirmed that the correct terminology is "shoulder widening" and would be clarified before the documents are submitted to the Board or VDOT.

Mr. Semmes solicited public comment.

Ms. Donna Bristow, 312 Robs Road, asked if a stop sign or flashing light could be placed at the intersection of Lakeside Drive and Dare Road because many accidents have occurred there. Mr. Cross said the Transportation Safety Commission would be the appropriate venue for this concern and he would introduce it at the next meeting.

Mr. Simasek moved the adoption of Resolution R00-32 and it carried 7:0. Mr. Shepperd subsequently noted a typographical error on the draft resolution and moved the adoption of a revised resolution, R00-32(R), which carried unanimously.

PC00-32(R)

On motion of Mr. Shepperd, which carried 7:0, the following resolution was adopted:

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A
PROJECT PRIORITY LISTING FOR SECONDARY ROAD CONSTRUCTION
FOR THE SIX-YEAR PERIOD FY2001-2002 THROUGH FY2006-2007

WHEREAS, the York County Planning Commission has been requested to give consideration and provide advice to the Board of Supervisors on a proposed program of secondary road improvements contained in the six-year plan; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer of the Virginia Department of Transportation has provided a recommended program which the Commission has carefully considered; and

WHEREAS, the York County Planning Commission has specifically reviewed the proposed projects with respect to their conformance with the York County Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the York County Planning Commission has received public comments and carefully considered the public comments and staff recommendation with respect to this proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 8th day of November, 2000, that the Commission does hereby make the following recommendations to the Board of Supervisors with respect to the project priorities for the Six-Year Secondary Road Plan during the six-year period of FY2001-2002 through FY-2006-2007:

1. **Lakeside Drive** – intersection improvements between Beechwood Drive and Dare Road
2. **Dare Road** – install a left turn lane along westbound lane at Constitution Drive
3. **Big Bethel Road** – intersection improvements at Route 134 and Route 171
4. **Fort Eustis Boulevard Extension** – construct a new road on a new location between the current terminus at Patriot Square Shopping Center and Goodwin Neck Road at its intersection with Seaford Road
5. **Penniman Road** – reconstruct and pave from Alexander Lee Parkway to Fillmore Drive
6. **Carys Chapel Road** – construct intersection improvement at Victory Boulevard
7. **Grafton Drive/Burts Road** – realign Grafton Drive/Route 17 intersection and reconstruct to approximately 0.2 mile north of Route 17
8. **Burts Road** – realign and connect with Grafton Drive intersection and reconstruct to approximately 0.3 mile south of Route 17
9. **Yorkville Road** – improve curve

10. **Yorktown Road** – reconstruct from Tabb Lane to Big Bethel Road
11. **Seaford Road** – widen shoulder between Goodwin Neck Road and Seaford Elementary School
12. **Allens Mill Road** – drainage and spot safety improvements
13. **Burts Road** – reconstruct from 0.3 mile south of Route 17 to Oriana Road
14. **Newman Road** – reconstruct curve
15. **Waller Mill Rail Trail** – provide 20% local match for Enhancements Program for construction of a multi-use path parallel to Airport Road
16. **Cook Road** – provide 20% local match for CMAQ-funded project to construct bicycle lanes between the northern intersection of Surrender Road and Moore House Road

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission does hereby find that, as required by Section 15.2-2232, Code of Virginia, the projects and priorities contained in this plan conform with the York County Comprehensive Plan, Charting the Course to 2015.

STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Joe Sisler, Engineering Manager, Department of Environmental and Development Services, made a presentation on the County stormwater drainage system. Copies of his visual aids are attached to the minutes of record.

Mr. Tim Cross reported on recent actions by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Cross reported on the current status of the Zoning Ordinance revision project, stating that staff had met with representatives of the York County Business Association to discuss some of the concepts presented to the Commission, particularly lighting and signage. The staff is drafting language to make the Ordinance easy to understand and administer and is targeting the first quarter of 2001 to present the language to the Commission for consideration, he added, after which the Commission may decide to conduct work sessions to undertake its review.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Simasek stated that the Regional Issues Committee met in October and is continuing its discussion of highway and directional signage leading to the City of Williamsburg and placement of underground wires. All of the corridor improvements are targeted for completion before the Jamestown anniversary celebration in 2007, he added.

COMMISSION REPORTS

Mr. Shepperd requested a report on neighborhood signs for rezonings and particularly the County's recourse when a sign disappears. Mr. Cross explained the procedure for placing notification signs, mailing first-class or certified letters with zoning maps to all adjacent property owners, running legal notices in the newspaper, and placing agendas on the County web site as well as agendas and videos on Channel 46. He said that whenever the staff is notified that a sign is missing, staff replaces it, but is usually unaware of a missing sign until the planner returns to get the sign following final determination of the application.

FUTURE BUSINESS

Mr. Cross reported to the Commission on the application for public hearing in December.

Mr. Simasek requested that staff ensure that sketch plans and other materials attached to staff memoranda are legible. Mr. Heavner suggested that sketch plans in an 11"x17" format be sent to the Commission when they are available if necessary for legibility.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Chair called adjournment at 9:43 P.M.

SUBMITTED: /s/
Phyllis P. Liscum, Secretary

APPROVED: /s/
Spencer W. Semmes, Chair

DATE: December 13, 2000